arXiv:1607.03775v2 [stat.ME] 20 Apr 2017

Causal inference to formalize responsibility analyses in road safety epidemiology

M. Dufournet[(1)], E. Lanoy[(2),(3)], J.L. Martin[(1)], V. Viallon[(1)]

[(1)] Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Ifsttar, UMRESTTE, UMR T_9405, F-69373 LYON

[(2)] Gustave Roussy, Université Paris-Saclay, Service de biostatistique et d'épidémiologie, Villejuif, F-94805

[(3)] Université Paris-Saclay, Univ. Paris-Sud, UVSQ, CESP, INSERM, Villejuif, F-94085

Abstract

The last few decades have seen the Structural Causal Model framework provide valuable tools to assess causal effects from observational data. In this article, we briefly review recent results regarding the recoverability of causal effects from selection biased data, and apply them to the case of responsibility analyses in road safety epidemiology. Our objective is to formally determine which effects can be unbiasedly estimated through this type of analyses, depending on available data. We consider the estimation of the causal effect of alcohol in two situations. First, when data are available for all types of crashes, we show that the causal odds-ratio of alcohol on the responsibility to trigger a car accident can be approximated under some assumptions. However, available data most often depends on the accident severity, which is related to speed. In this case, the causal odds-ratio of alcohol is not recoverable. We present numerical results to illustrate our arguments and the magnitude of the bias. We finally show that this bias makes association measures not only externally, but also internally invalid.

Keywords: causal inference; recoverability ; selection bias; responsibility analysis; road safety.

1 Introduction

Research into road safety must recognise causality. Preventing road crashes, in the interest of public health and safety, implies identifying the underlying causes of crashes. In the field, main causes of the occurrence and severity of road crashes due to human behavior have been established: driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, inappropriate speed, distracted driving, etc. Questions asked by decision-makers now mostly concern the magnitude of their causal effects (on the excess risk, relative risk or odds-ratio scale), as well as the burden of deaths or victims attributable to these various causes of accident ([1]).

In order to measure causal effects, the ideal designs are interventional studies such as the randomized

clinical trial ([2]). However, interventional studies are not always possible in epidemiology or clinical research, either for ethical, costs or other technical reasons ([3]). Consequently, it is common to only have access to observational data. In this case, two main sources of bias often arise: confounding and selection bias ([4, 5, 6, 7]).

In the case of road safety epidemiology, no interventional study can be performed for clear ethical reasons. In addition, data are usually only available when the outcome of interest, the accident, occurred. Indeed, data are restricted to drivers and vehicles involved in road accidents only, and often to severe road accidents only (e.g., injury or fatal accidents). This extreme selection bias precludes the estimation of the effect of any exposure on the risk of car accident. Two closely related approaches have been adopted to circumvent this issue of "selected" drivers: quasi-induced exposure ([8]) and responsibility analysis ([9, 10, 11, 12]). They first rely on the assessment of the responsibility of each driver involved in crashes, usually from police reports. They then consist in comparing responsible drivers with non-responsible drivers among involved drivers. The underlying assumption is that non-responsible drivers represent a random sample of the general driving population that was "selected" to crash by circumstances beyond their control and therefore have the same risk factor profile as other drivers on the road at the same time ([12, 13]). A standard claim is that "if this randomness assumption is met, then the risk estimate derived from a responsibility analysis would be expected to be similar to that from a standard case-control study" ([12, 13]). Even if some authors have raised questions about the validity of these approaches ([14]), induced exposure and responsibility analysis are now widely adopted in the field ([15, 16, 17]).

However, the randomness assumption is questionable, because the inclusion in the dataset depends on the occurence of the accident. So in this article, we insist on the estimation of causal effect in the presence of selection bias (see discussion for confounding bias). We adress these questions by applying general concepts of causal inference theory under the Structural Causal Model (SCM) framework ([18, 19]). We mostly consider two cases: (i) when data are available for all types of crashes and the causal effect of interest is the effect of alcohol on the risk of being responsible for a road accident and (ii) when data are available for severe crashes only and the causal effect of interest is the effect of alcohol on the risk of being responsible for a severe road accident. These two types of available data correspond to different schemes of selection bias, which may alter the randomness assumption.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 below, we briefly recall some basics of the SCM framework and recent results regarding *the recoverability* of causal effects in the presence of selection bias. In Section 3, the application to responsibility analyses is presented, under both cases (i) and

(*ii*). In Section 4, we present results from a simple numerical analysis to illustrate the magnitude of bias under both cases. In Section 5, we conclude with some leads for future research.

2 Causal inference in the presence of selection bias

In this section, we present the Structural Causal Model (SCM) framework and study the recoverability of causal effects in the general context of selection biased data.

We consider the scenario where Y denotes a dichotomous outcome, X a binary exposure of interest, and $\boldsymbol{W}$ is a vector of additional categorical variables. We will denote by $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ the set of observable variables $(X, \boldsymbol{W}, Y)$. The causal model $\mathcal{M}$ leading to Y can be graphically represented by a DAG G (Directed Acyclic Graph) ([20, 21, 22]). In the SCM framework, the DAG is associated to a set of structural funtions, each corresponding to one of the covariates in the DAG. See Appendix A for more details. This set of equations allows the definition of Y_x, the counterfactual outcome that would have been observed in the counterfactual world where exposure would have been set to $X = x$, for $x \in \{0, 1\}$. Then, causal effects can be precisely defined. In particular, in the simple case considered here where both X and Y are binary, the average causal total effect (ACE) of X on Y is defined as:

$$\text{ACE} = \mathbb{E}(Y_1 - Y_0) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 1). \tag{1}$$

Here, the causal effect is defined on the excess risk scale, but causal risk ratio or odds-ratio can be defined similarly.

Causal inference is mainly concerned with the identification of $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ for $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and then of the causal effects, from the distribution of the observed variables $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \boldsymbol{v})$ ([23]). When there is no selection bias, criteria such as the back-door and the front-door criteria ensure the identifiability of causal effects ([20, 19]). When selection bias is present, the binary variable S indicating inclusion in the study has to be added to G, leading to a new DAG G_s. It is standard to represent S in a specific way in G_s to emphasize that S does not play any role in the causal model described by G but plays a role in the selection process since data are only available for individuals for whom $S = 1$ (see Figure 1). Then, the question is the recoverability of $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ for $x \in \{0, 1\}$ in terms of the observable distribution $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \boldsymbol{v}|S = 1)$ ([24, 23]). Recoverability can be seen as a generalization of identifiability in the presence of selection bias. Whether this selection bias may result in biased estimation of the causal effects of interest depends on the structure of G_s, and in particular on the arrows pointing to

or emanating from S in G_s ([25]). Two types of results allow us to determine whether the causal effect is recoverable depending on the structure of the DAG G_s. First, [23] define necessary and sufficient conditions ensuring the recoverability of the quantity $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$, and as a byproduct the recoverability of the causal effects (causal excess risk, causal relative risk, causal odds-ratio), in the presence of selection bias. Second, under some assumptions, causal odds-ratios are recoverable from selection biased data in some situations where the distribution $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ and other causal effects are not ([24]). For illustration, and motivated by the context of responsibility analyses, we mostly focus on situations where inclusion in the study depends on the outcome Y, as in DAGs A and B of Figure 1. We also consider the case where S is a descendant of a mediator, as in DAG C of Figure 1.



Figure 1: Examples of DAGs in the presence of selection bias

2.1 Recoverability of $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ in the presence of selection bias

A central result for the recoverability of $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ in the presence of selection bias is stated by [23]. As above, denote by G the DAG of interest, composed of the observable variables $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, and by G_s the DAG obtained after the addition of the selection variable S in G. For any $\boldsymbol{C} \subseteq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, further define $G_{\boldsymbol{C}}$ the subgraph of DAG G composed of the variables in $\boldsymbol{C}$ only. For any $V_i \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, further denote by $An(V_i)_G$ the union of V_i and the ancestors of V_i in DAG G. Then, Theorem 2 in [23] states that $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ is recoverable from selection biased data if and only if

$$\text{(C.1)} \qquad An(Y)_{G_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\setminus X}} \cap An(S)_{G_s} = \emptyset.$$

Condition (C.1) above is violated in the three examples depicted in DAGs A, B and C of Figure 1. For instance, we have $Y \in An(Y)_{G_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\setminus X}} \cap An(S)_{G_s}$ in DAGs A and B, and $M \in An(Y)_{G_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\setminus X}} \cap An(S)_{G_s}$ in DAG C. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ is not recoverable under these types of selection bias. Examples of DAGs ensuring that $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ is recoverable from selection biased data can be found in [23].

2.2 Recoverability of causal odds-ratios in the presence of selection bias

Assume that $\boldsymbol{W}$ is a vector of confounders between X and Y, as in DAGs A, B and C. Here, we consider the recoverability of $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific causal odds-ratio

$$COR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})/\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 0|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})/\mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 0|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}.$$

The $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific causal odds-ratio is the causal odds-ratio in the stratum of the population defined by $\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}$. When $\boldsymbol{W}$ contains a set of sufficient confounders, conditional ignorability $Y_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\boldsymbol{W}$ holds ([18, 26, 27]), so that $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$. Then, $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific causal odds-ratio equals the adjusted odds-ratio

$$OR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})/\mathbb{P}(Y = 0|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})/\mathbb{P}(Y = 0|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}.$$

Following Definition 2 of [24], $OR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$, and then in our case $COR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$, are recoverable from selection biased data if the assumptions embedded in the DAG renders it expressible in terms of the observable distribution $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \boldsymbol{v}|S = 1)$. The symmetry of the odds-ratio $OR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) = OR(Y, X|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ makes it recoverable in some situations where $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ is not. More precisely, Theorem 1 in [24], or Corollary 4 in [28], states that $OR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is recoverable from selection biased data if and only if

$$\text{(C.2)} \qquad X \perp\!\!\!\perp S|(Y, \boldsymbol{W}) \text{ or } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp S|(X, \boldsymbol{W}).$$

This condition holds under DAG A, but is not guaranteed under DAGs B and C. Consequently, $OR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ and then $COR(X, Y|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ are recoverable under DAG A, while they are not under DAGs B and C.

3 Application to responsibility analyses

We can now check whether the conditions to recover causal total effects in the presence of selection bias hold in the particular setting of responsibility analyses. As a leading example, we will consider the estimation of the causal total effect of blood concentration of alcohol on "responsibility" among drivers involved in a car crash.

3.1 Two possible surrogate outcomes in responsibility analyses

First, let us formalize what "responsibility" means in responsibility analyses. In this context, the "responsibility" of a driver is not entirely driven by the determination of a legal fault. A driver

involved in a crash is considered as responsible of this crash if he committed a driving fault (lane departure, failure to obey traffic signs, driving against traffic, etc), which should trigger the crash. The responsibility, which is assigned after the crash from police reports, is a measure of the driving fault, which takes place before the crash. We will denote by F the binary variable indicating whether the driver commits a driving fault. Observe that this variable is defined for all drivers, not only those involved in a crash. Further denote by A the binary variable indicating whether this driver is involved in an accident. We also consider the binary variable R indicating whether the driver is responsible for an accident. So, $R = F \times A$, and we have:

$$\begin{cases} R = 1 & \text{if and only if } A = 1 \text{ and } F = 1 \\ R = 0 & \text{if } A = 1 \text{ and } F = 0 \\ R = 0 & \text{if } A = 0 \text{ even if } F = 1. \end{cases}$$

Most often, available data depend on the accident severity, which is related to speed. Define $\mathcal{A}$ the binary variable indicating the occurrence of a severe accident. Then, we can analogously define the binary variable $\mathcal{R}$ indicating whether the driver is responsible for a severe accident. So, $\mathcal{R} = F \times \mathcal{A}$. The DAG G below represents a simplified causal mechanism which leads to an accident or a severe accident. We denote by $\boldsymbol{W}$ the set of all confounders (*e.g.*, age, sex, daytime, period of the year, speed limit etc.). Here, X is the binary exposure indicating whether a given driver has a blood concentration of alcohol above the legal limit. It is commonly accepted that alcohol X is related to speed V, so there is an arrow from X to V. V is the binary variable indicating whether a given driver drives at high speed. The fact that there is no arrow pointing from V to A, but there is an arrow pointing to V to $\mathcal{A}$ has to be clarified. This difference is related to the definition of F. Indeed, if speed was considered as a cause of an accident, it would mean that speed was inappropriate, and therefore that a fault has been committed. Therefore, V is a cause of A only through F. However, V has an effect on $\mathcal{A}$, because speed has an effect on the severity of an accident.

In Sections 3.2 and 3.3 below, we apply the principles presented in Section 2 on two particular situations: (i) the ideal one, when data are available for all types of crashes ($A = 1$) and the causal total effect of interest is that of X on the risk of being responsible of a road accident R and (ii) the common one, when data are available for severe crashes only ($\mathcal{A} = 1$) and the causal total effect of interest is that of X on the risk of being responsible of a severe road accident $\mathcal{R}$. Two simplified versions of these two cases are given in Figure 3. In case (i), because V has no effect on A, the effect of X on A is entirely mediated by F, while, in case (ii), the effect of X on $\mathcal{A}$ is mediated by both F and V.



Figure 2: DAG G representing the causal mechanism leading to the occurence of an accident A or a severe accident $\mathcal{A}$.

(i) with data from all types of accidents

(ii) with data from severe accidents only



Figure 3: DAGs G_s in responsibility analyses

3.2 Responsibility analyses when data from all types of accidents are available

A version of the DAG G_s is represented in the left panel of Figure 3 when data from all types of accidents are available. As before, A represents the occurrence of a crash, on which selection depends in the sense that $S = 1 \Rightarrow A = 1$. In this case (i), the effect of X on A is entirely mediated by F and $X \perp\!\!\!\perp A|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$.

Because $A \in An(R)_{G_{\boldsymbol{V}\setminus X}} \cap An(S)_{G_s}$, results presented in Section 2 indicate that $\mathbb{P}(R_x = r)$ is not recoverable in this context, for $(x, r) \in \{0, 1\}$. Regarding $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific odds-ratios, $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is not recoverable since neither $X \perp\!\!\!\perp S|(R, \boldsymbol{W})$ nor $R \perp\!\!\!\perp S|(X, \boldsymbol{W})$ is guaranteed. However, $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is recoverable because $X \perp\!\!\!\perp S|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$, which is implied by $X \perp\!\!\!\perp A|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$. In

other words, $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ equals

$$= \frac{\mathbb{P}(F=1|X=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)/\mathbb{P}(F=0|X=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)}{\mathbb{P}(F=1|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)/\mathbb{P}(F=0|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)} \\ \frac{\mathbb{P}(R=1|X=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)/\mathbb{P}(R=0|X=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)}{\mathbb{P}(R=1|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)/\mathbb{P}(R=0|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},A=1)},$$

where the last equality comes from the fact that $F = R$ in the subpopulation $\{A = 1\}$. In addition, if $\mathbb{P}(F_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ and $\mathbb{P}(R_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ are both small for $x \in \{0, 1\}$, it can be shown that

$$COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \approx COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}). \tag{2}$$

See Appendix B for the proof of this result, which especially uses the fact that $X \perp\!\!\!\perp A|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$. Therefore, if $\mathbb{P}(F_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ and $\mathbb{P}(R_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ are small, $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is approximately recoverable in case (i).

Note that the approximate recoverability of the $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific causal odds-ratios $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is not sufficient for the approximate recoverability of the population causal odds-ratio $COR(X, R)$. However, the recoverability of adjusted causal odds-ratio $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is still useful for instance to derive estimates of population attributable fractions (PAF). See Appendix C for more details.

3.3 Responsibility analyses when data from severe accidents only are available

In road safety epidemiology, available data are mainly composed of severe accidents. So inclusion in the study depends on the severity of the accident. A version of the DAG G_s is represented in the right panel of Figure 3. As before, $\mathcal{A}$ represents the occurrence of a severe crash, on which selection depends in the sense that $\mathcal{S} = 1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{A} = 1$. In this case (ii), the effect of V on A is not entirely mediated by F anymore and $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{A}|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$ does not hold.

As in Section 3.2, neither $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = r)$ nor $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is recoverable. But now, it is not straightforward to approximate $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ by a recoverable causal effect. First, Equation (2) is not valid here because $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{A}|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$ is not guaranteed. Second, and above all, $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is not recoverable since neither $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{A}|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$ nor $F \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{A}|(X, \boldsymbol{W})$ generally holds. Note that, if there were no arrow between X and V, $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ would be recoverable, and so $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ could be approximated.

In our situation where there is an arrow between X and V, the validity of association measures conditioned on $\mathcal{S} = 1$ is therefore questionable. According to [29], "internal validity implies validity of

inference for the source population of study subjects", while a result is externally valid if it is generalizable "to people outside that population", that is the target population. A more formal definition can be proposed, based on causal considerations. In our case, the sample consists of individuals such that $\{\mathcal{S}=1\}$, while the source and target populations are made of individuals such that $\{\mathcal{A}=1\}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}=1\}\cup\{\mathcal{A}=0\}$ respectively. Consider the observable adjusted odds-ratio $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)$, which equals

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}=1|X=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}=0|X=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}=1|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}=0|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)}.$$

We will say $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)$ is externally valid if it equals the adjusted causal odds-ratio in the target population $COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w})$. We will say it is internally valid if it equals the adjusted causal odds-ratio in the source population, $COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$, with

$$COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)=\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1=0|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0=0|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)}.$$

According to the results stated above, $COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w})$ is not recoverable. In particular, $COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w})$ is not equal to $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)$, which is therefore not externally valid. Note that in case (i), $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)$ is externally valid.

In order to study whether $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)$ is internally valid, let us consider the case where $\{\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{A}\}$, for simplicity. Then the question reduces to assessing whether $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)=COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$. This equality holds if $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}=1|X=x,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)=\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$, which is guaranteed if $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\boldsymbol{W},\mathcal{A})$. But conditioning on $\mathcal{A}$ breaks the ignorability condition. Indeed, $\boldsymbol{W}$ satisfies the back-door criterion and $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\boldsymbol{W}$, but $(\boldsymbol{W},\mathcal{A})$ does not satisfy the back-door criterion and we generally do not have $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\boldsymbol{W},\mathcal{A})$; see Appendix D for a simple proof by a reduction to absurdity argument. As a result, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}=1|X=x,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$ generally differs from $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$, and $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$ is not internally valid. In other words, even in the most favorable situation where $\{\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{A}\}$, the observable adjusted odds-ratio $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{S}=1)=OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$ can not be interpreted as the causal odds-ratio in the source population $COR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$. As mentioned in [24], $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$ "does not stand for a causal effect in a stable subset of individuals", because $\mathcal{A}$ is a descendant of X. More precisely, using the fact that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\boldsymbol{W},\mathcal{A}_x)$, it can be shown (See Appendix E) that the adjusted odds-ratio conditioned on $\mathcal{A}=1$ is

$$OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)=\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_1=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1=0|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_1=1)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_0=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0=0|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_0=1)}.$$

Because subsets $\{\mathcal{A}_0=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}_1=1,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w}\}$ correspond to different subsets of individuals, $OR(X,\mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}=1)$ has to be interpreted with caution.

This issue is not restricted to responsibility analyses. It is known that selection on the outcome, as well as selection on a variable affected by the outcome, can lead to bias ([30]). Moreover, selectionning on a descendant of the exposure in the DAG is known as a more general phenomenon called collider bias ([5, 29]), that is for instance at play in the obesity paradox explained by [31, 32].

4 Numerical illustration

Here, we present simple numerical results in the absence of confounders to check the absence of bias in case (i), and to illustrate the magnitude of bias in case (ii). A more thorough numerical analysis will be considered in future research. The generative model described below is in the most general case, the case (ii), where we consider $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{R}$. Case (i) will be illustrated by setting some parameters to zero in this generative model.

4.1 Data generation mechanism

We consider a generative model consistent with the right panel of Figure 3. More precisely, our data generation mechanism is obtained by specifying the structural functions f_F, $f_{\mathcal{A}}$, f_X, and f_V as well as the distributions of the disturbances ε_F, $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{A}}$, ε_X, and ε_V.

Denote the indicator function by $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$. Define four independent random variables ε_F, $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{A}}$, ε_X, and ε_V distributed according to a uniform distribution over the interval $[0, 1]$. For any given $p_X \in (0, 1)$, define $X = \mathbb{I}[\varepsilon_X \leq p_X]$ so that $X \sim B(p_X)$ is a Bernoulli variable. We consider the special case where $p_X = 0.5$. Now, introduce the sigmoid function $\mathrm{h}(x) = (1 + \exp(-x))^{-1}$, and set, for any $(x, v, f) \in \{0, 1\}^3$ and for some real parameters $\alpha_0, \alpha_X, \beta_0, \beta_X, \beta_V, \gamma_0, \gamma_F, \gamma_V$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_V(x) &= \mathrm{h}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_X x) \\
p_F(x, v) &= \mathrm{h}(\beta_0 + \beta_X x + \beta_V v) \\
p_{\mathcal{A}}(f, v) &= \mathrm{h}(\gamma_0 + \gamma_F f + \gamma_V v).
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, variables V, F, $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{R}$ are defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
V &= f_V(X, \varepsilon_V) = \mathbb{I}[\varepsilon_V \leq p_V(X)], \\
F &= f_F(X, V, \varepsilon_F) = \mathbb{I}[\varepsilon_F \leq p_F(X, V)], \\
\mathcal{A} &= f_{\mathcal{A}}(F, V, \varepsilon_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathbb{I}[\varepsilon_{\mathcal{A}} \leq p_{\mathcal{A}}(F, V)], \\
\mathcal{R} &= F \times \mathcal{A}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, for $\nu \geq 0$, we set

$$\alpha_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_X$$
$$\beta_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\beta_X + \beta_V - \nu\right)$$
$$\gamma_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\gamma_F + \gamma_V - \nu\right)$$

Then, we compute causal effects and the measure of association on the odds-ratio scale defined below :

$$COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(F_1 = 1|W = w)/\mathbb{P}(F_1 = 0|W = w)}{\mathbb{P}(F_0 = 1|W = w)/\mathbb{P}(F_0 = 0|W = w)},$$
$$COR(X, \mathcal{R}|W = w) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1 = 1|W = w)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1 = 0|W = w)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0 = 1|W = w)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0 = 0|W = w)},$$
$$OR(X, F|W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 1, W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)/\mathbb{P}(F = 0|X = 1, W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 0, W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)/\mathbb{P}(F = 0|X = 0, W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)}.$$

Under our generative model, we get, for $x \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(F_x = 1|W = w) &= \mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = x, W = w) \\
&= \sum_{v \in (0,1)} \{\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = x, V = v, W = w)\mathbb{P}(V = v|X = x, W = w)\} \\
&= \mathrm{h}(\beta_0 + \beta_X x + \beta_V)\mathrm{h}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_X x) + \mathrm{h}(\beta_0 + \beta_X x)\mathrm{h}(-(\alpha_0 + \alpha_X x))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = 1|W = w) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} = 1, F = 1|W = w) \\
&= \sum_{v \in (0,1)} \{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} = 1|F = 1, V = v, W = w)\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = x, V = v, W = w) \\
&\qquad \mathbb{P}(V = v|X = x, W = w)\} \\
&= \mathrm{h}(\gamma_0 + \gamma_F + \gamma_V)\mathrm{h}(\beta_0 + \beta_X x + \beta_V)\mathrm{h}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_X x) + \\
&\quad \mathrm{h}(\gamma_0 + \gamma_F)\mathrm{h}(\beta_0 + \beta_X x)\mathrm{h}(-(\alpha_0 + \alpha_X x))
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(F=1|X=x,W=w,\mathcal{A}=1)\\
&=\frac{\mathbb{P}(F=1,X=x,W=w,\mathcal{A}=1)}{\mathbb{P}(X=x,W=w,\mathcal{A}=1)}\\
&=\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}=1|F=1,X=x,W=w)\mathbb{P}(F=1X=x,W=w)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}=1|X=x,W=w)\mathbb{P}(X=x|W=w)\mathbb{P}(W=w)}\\
&=\frac{\sum\limits_{v\in(0,1)}\{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}=1|F=1,V=v,W=w)\mathbb{P}(F=1|X=x,V=v,W=w)\mathbb{P}(V=v|X=x,W=w)\}}{\sum\limits_{v,f\in(0,1)}\{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}=1|F=f,V=v,W=w)\mathbb{P}(F=1|X=x,V=v,W=w)\mathbb{P}(V=v|X=x,W=w)\}}\\
&=\mathrm{h}(\gamma_0+\gamma_F+\gamma_V)\mathrm{h}(\beta_0+\beta_X x+\beta_V)\mathrm{h}(\alpha_0+\alpha_X x)+\mathrm{h}(\gamma_0+\gamma_F)\mathrm{h}(\beta_0+\beta_X x)\mathrm{h}(-(\alpha_0+\alpha_X x))\times\\
&\quad[\mathrm{h}(\gamma_0+\gamma_F+\gamma_V)\mathrm{h}(\beta_0+\beta_X x+\beta_V)\mathrm{h}(\alpha_0+\alpha_X x)+\mathrm{h}(\gamma_0+\gamma_F)\mathrm{h}(\beta_0+\beta_X x)\mathrm{h}(-(\alpha_0+\alpha_X x))+\\
&\quad\mathrm{h}(\gamma_0+\gamma_V)\mathrm{h}(-(\beta_0+\beta_X x+\beta_V))\mathrm{h}(\alpha_0+\alpha_X x)+\mathrm{h}(\gamma_0)\mathrm{h}(-(\beta_0+\beta_X x))\mathrm{h}(-(\alpha_0+\alpha_X x))]^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

4.2 Results

We present results under configurations where $\beta_V = 1$ and $\gamma_F = 4$, because speed V increases the risk of comitting a fault and because F largely increases the risk of having an accident. To choose $\nu = 13$ leads to have prevalences of A, R, and F inferior than $10^{-6}\%$, which can be considered as realistic. Then, we make the tree remaining parameters, α_X, β_X and γ_V, vary between 0 and 3, because alcohol X increases speed V and the risk of committing a fault F, and V increases the severity of the accident. Results are presented in Figure 4.

First, in the situation where $\gamma_V = 0$, which mimics case (i), our results confirm that there is no bias between $COR(X, F|W = w)$ and $OR(X, F|W = w, A = 1)$, whatever the value of α_X or β_X. It can also be seen that $COR(X, R|W = w) \simeq COR(X, F|W = w)$, so that $COR(X, R|W = w)$ can be well-approximated by $COR(X, F|W = w)$.

In the situation where $\gamma_V \neq 0$, we observe bias between $COR(X, F|W = w)$ and $OR(X, F|W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)$ as soon as $\alpha_X \neq 0$, and it increases with α_X or β_X. So, in the case where X increases V, $OR(X, F|W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)$ underestimates the real causal effect $COR(X, F|W = w)$. We can also observe that $COR(X, R|W = w)$ cannot be approximated by $COR(X, F|W = w)$ anymore. Finally, the higher the value of γ_V, the higher the magnitude of the bias. Note that there is also no bias when $\alpha_X = 0$, whatever the value of γ_V, which corresponds to the absence of arrow between X and V in case (ii).



Figure 4: Causal and associational odds-ratios in the case where $\beta_V = 1$ and $\gamma_F = 4$, and for varying values of the other parameters $\alpha_X, \beta_X, \gamma_V$. In each panel, along the x axis, α_X or β_X are varied from 0 to 3, and the other parameter is set to 1.

To recap, even under the simple generative model considered here, we can observe that the observable associational effect $OR(X, F|W = w, A = 1)$ unbiasedly estimates $COR(X, F|W = w)$ when $\gamma_V = 0$ or $\alpha_X = 0$. Otherwise, $OR(X, F|W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)$ underestimates the real causal effect under the settings considered here.

5 Discussion

In this article, we lay the emphasis on the conditions ensuring the recoverability of causal effects in the presence of selection bias. We apply these conditions to provide a formal description of responsibility analyses, which is commonly used in the field of road safety epidemiology.

Focusing on an exposure X defined as blood alcohol concentration above the legal limit, and its effect on R or $\mathcal{R}$, we show that $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific causal odds-ratios $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is not recoverable *(i)* when data from all types of accident are available and *(ii)* when data from the most severe accidents only are available. Under some additional assumptions, $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ can be approximated by $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ in case *(i)*. However, case *(i)* is not the most common situation in practice: even when data for property damaged accidents are available, the least severe ones are generally not reported. And in this case, $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is not recoverable and can not be approximated. We use numerical examples to illustrate our arguments. In particular, we show that, in case (ii), the observable associational effect $OR(X, F|W = w, \mathcal{A} = 1)$ underestimates causal effects $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ or $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ in the situations where X and V are positively correlated.

As a matter of fact, available controls in case *(ii)* are not representative of the non-responsible drivers ($\mathcal{R} = 0$). Indeed, this population is composed by three types of drivers: the ones for whom $(F = 0, \mathcal{A} = 0)$, the ones for whom $(F = 0, \mathcal{A} = 1)$, and the ones for whom $(F = 1, \mathcal{A} = 0)$. However, because data describes drivers involved in a crash only, the control group in case (ii) is only composed of drivers who did not commit a driving fault but had a severe accident $(F = 0, \mathcal{A} = 1)$. There is no reason why this subgroup of non-responsible drivers should be similar to the two other subgroups. In particular, drivers involved in a severe crash are likely to drive faster than those who are not involved in an accident, since crash severity is partly caused by speed. Because inappropriate speed is related to alcohol, the subpopulations $(F = 0, \mathcal{A} = 0)$ and $(F = 0, \mathcal{A} = 1)$ are different regarding exposure X. Some authors have sensed this non-representativeness issue and have proposed a heuristic transformation of the control group to make the final sample resemble that from a case-control study ([33]). However, there is no way to assess whether the final sample is indeed representative

without additional information regarding $\mathbb{P}(X)$ for instance. This type of additional information could also make adjusted causal odds-ratio $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$, causal odds-ratio $COR(X, \mathcal{R})$ or even $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = r)$, for $(x, r) \in \{0, 1\}$, recoverable from the available data, even if the structure of the DAG alone does not make these quantities recoverable. One interesting lead for future research would be to use our formalisation of responsibility analyses to determine which additional information would be sufficient to recover causal effects such as $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$. Note that if we choose an exposure X, which has no effect on V, $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is recoverable and $COR(X, \mathcal{R}|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ can be approximated.

In other respect, selection bias is not the only issue in responsibility analyses. First, for drivers involved in a crash, responsibility is usually determined from police reports, from an algorithm ([34, 11]), or by experts. This assigned responsibility is a noisy measure of the true responsibility. In particular, when responsibility is assigned by experts, a safe rule would be to remove all information regarding X from police reports so that experts are blinded to exposure status ([12]). Otherwise, it is possible that experts use the information regarding X when assigning drivers' responsibility, which is particularly problematic ([16]). Second, unmeasured confounders are sources of confounding bias. For instance, risk proneness is likely to be a common cause of alcohol consumption and inappropriate speed, and is therefore a confounder regarding the causal relationship between X and A (or $\mathcal{A}$). It is generally unobserved and only loosely related to age, gender, etc, so that adjusting for these covariates is not sufficient and confounding bias arises.

Finally, when the $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific causal odds-ratio $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is not recoverable or can not be approximated, we can only estimate quantities such as $OR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}, \mathcal{A} = 1)$, where $\mathcal{A}$ denote the occurence of a severe accident. From a causal point of view, this quantity has to be interpreted carefully, since it equals $\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_1=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1=0|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_1=1)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0=1|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_0=1)/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0=0|\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w},\mathcal{A}_0=1)}$, and subpopulations $\{\mathcal{A}_1 = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}_0 = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}\}$ can be quite different. This formal interpretation of the estimable quantity in the presence of selection bias is not only useful in the context of responsibility analyses. It is for instance useful to explain the obesity paradox ([32]).

References

[1] P. Cummings, F. P. Rivara, C. M. Olson, and K. Smith, "Changes in traffic crash mortality rates attributed to use of alcohol, or lack of a seat belt, air bag, motorcycle helmet, or bicycle helmet, united states, 1982–2001," *Injury Prevention*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 148–154, 2006.

[2] J. S. Mill, *A System of logic, ratiocinative and inductive, being a connected view of the principles of evidence, and the methods of scientific investigation.* Harper and Brothers, New York, eighth edition, 1843.

[3] M. Baiocchi, J. Cheng, and D. S. Small, "Instrumental variable methods for causal inference," *Statistics in Medicine*, vol. 33, pp. 2297–2340, June 2014. WOS:000335772800011.

[4] M. A. Hernán, S. Hernández-Díaz, M. M. Werler, and A. A. Mitchell, "Causal knowledge as a prerequisite for confounding evaluation: an application to birth defects epidemiology," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 155, no. 2, pp. 176–184, 2002.

[5] S. Greenland, "Quantifying biases in causal models: classical confounding vs collider-stratification bias," *Epidemiology*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 300–306, 2003.

[6] F. Elwert, "Graphical causal models," in *Handbook of causal analysis for social research*, pp. 245–273, Springer, 2013.

[7] F. Elwert and C. Winship, "Endogenous selection bias: the problem of conditioning on a collider variable," *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 40, 2014.

[8] N. Stamatiadis and J. A. Deacon, "Quasi-induced exposure: methodology and insight," *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 37–52, 1997.

[9] H. Smith and R. Popham, "Blood alcohol levels in relation to driving.," *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 325–328, 1951.

[10] K. Perchonok, "Identification of specific problems and countermeasures targets for reducing alcohol related casualties." Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1978.

[11] K. Terhune, "Problems and methods in studying drug crash effects," *Alcohol, Drugs, and Driving*, vol. 2, no. 3-4, 1986.

[12] J. Brubacher, H. Chan, and M. Asbridge, "Culpability analysis is still a valuable technique," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 270–272, 2014.

[13] A. E. Wahlberg and L. Dorn, "Culpable versus non-culpable traffic accidents; what is wrong with this picture?," *Journal of Safety Research*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 453–459, 2007.

[14] P. Sanghavi, "Commentary: Culpability analysis won't help us understand crash risk due to cell phones," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 267–269, 2013.

[15] M. Asbridge, J. R. Brubacher, and H. Chan, "Cell phone use and traffic crash risk: a culpability analysis," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 259–267, 2013.

[16] L. R. Salmi, L. Orriols, and E. Lagarde, "Comparing responsible and non-responsible drivers to assess determinants of road traffic collisions: time to standardise and revisit," *Injury Prevention*, vol. 20, pp. 380–386, Jan. 2014.

[17] A. E. Wahlberg, "The determination of fault in collisions," in *Driver Behaviour and Accident Research Methodology: Unresolved Problems.* (G. Dorn, L Matthews and I. Glendon, eds.), pp. 101–120, Farnham, Surrey, IK: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

[18] J. Pearl, *Causality: models, reasoning, and inference*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[19] J. Pearl, "Causal inference in statistics: An overview," *Statistics Surveys*, vol. 3, no. 0, pp. 96–146, 2009.

[20] J. Pearl, "Causal diagrams for empirical research," *Biometrika*, vol. 82, pp. 669–688, Jan. 1995.

[21] S. Greenland, J. Pearl, and J. M. Robins, "Causal Diagrams for Epidemiologic Research," *Epidemiology*, vol. 10, pp. 37–48, Jan. 1999.

[22] M. Glymour, "Causal diagrams. modern epidemiology. edited by: Rothman kj, greenland s, lash tl. 2008," 2008.

[23] E. Bareinboim and J. Tian, "Recovering causal effects from selection bias.," in *Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI*, pp. 3475–3481, 2015.

[24] E. Bareinboim and J. Pearl, "Controlling selection bias in causal inference," *Proceedings of The Fifteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS 2012); JMLR*, vol. 22, pp. 100–108, 2012.

[25] M. A. Hernán, S. Hernández-Díaz, and J. M. Robins, "A structural approach to selection bias," *Epidemiology*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 615–625, 2004.

[26] T. J. VanderWeele and J. M. Robins, "Minimal sufficient causation and directed acyclic graphs," *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 1437–1465, 2009.

[27] T. J. VanderWeele and I. Shpitser, "A new criterion for confounder selection," *Biometrics*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 1406–1413, 2011.

[28] V. Didelez, S. Kreiner, and N. Keiding, "Graphical models for inference under outcome-dependent sampling," *Statistical Science*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 368–387, 2010.

[29] K. J. Rothman, S. Greenland, and T. L. Lash, *Modern Epidemiology*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.

[30] J. Berkson, "Limitations of the application of fourfold table analysis to hospital data," *Biometrics Bulletin*, vol. 2, pp. 47–53, 1946.

[31] M. Lajous, A. Bijon, G. Fagherazzi, M.-C. Boutron-Ruault, B. Balkau, F. Clavel-Chapelon, and M. A. Hernán, "Body mass index, diabetes, and mortality in french women: explaining away a "paradox"," *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, vol. 25, no. 1, p. 10, 2014.

[32] V. Viallon and M. Dufournet, "Can collider bias fully explain the obesity paradox?," *Epidemiology*, 2017.

[33] B. Laumon, B. Gadegbeku, J.-L. Martin, and M.-B. Biecheler, "Cannabis intoxication and fatal road crashes in france: population based case-control study," *BMJ*, vol. 331, no. 7529, p. 1371, 2005.

[34] M. D. Robertson and O. H. Drummer, "Responsibility analysis: A methodology to study the effects of drugs in driving," *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, vol. 26, pp. 243–247, Apr. 1994.

[35] J. Splawa-Neyman, "On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essay on Principles. Section 9," *Statistical Science*, vol. 5, pp. 465–472, Nov. 1990.

[36] D. B. Rubin, "Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 688–701, 1974.

[37] P. W. Holland, "Statistics and Causal Inference," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 81, pp. 945–960, Dec. 1986.

[38] J. M. Robins, M. A. Hernan, and B. Brumback, "Marginal structural models and causal inference in epidemiology," *Epidemiology*, pp. 550–560, 2000.

[39] J. Robins, "A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect," *Mathematical Modelling*, vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 1393–1512, 1986.

[40] P. R. Rosenbaum and D. B. Rubin, "The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects," *Biometrika*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 41–55, 1983.

[41] K. L. Moore, R. Neugebauer, M. J. Laan, and I. B. Tager, "Causal inference in epidemiological studies with strong confounding," *Statistics in medicine*, vol. 31, no. 13, pp. 1380–1404, 2012.

[42] J. Benichou, "A review of adjusted estimators of attributable risk," *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 195–216, 2001.

[43] P. Bruzzi, S. Green, D. Byar, L. Brinton, and C. Schairer, "Estimating the population attributable risk for multiple risk factors using case-control data," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 122, no. 5, pp. 904–914, 1985.

[44] T. S. Richardson and J. M. Robins, "Single world intervention graphs (swigs): A unification of the counterfactual and graphical approaches to causality," *Center for the Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington Series. Working Paper*, vol. 128, no. 30, p. 2013, 2013.

Appendix A Causal inference in the Structural Causal Model framework

This Appendix presents the basis of causal inference, with a special emphasis on the SCM framework ([18]). We consider the same simple setting as that of Section 2 where cause X and effect Y are binary, and vector $\boldsymbol{W}$ is a set of categorical variables. A first useful tool to describe causal assumptions underlying a causal model $\mathcal{M}$ is the DAG. See the three examples considered in Figure 5. Under each of these examples, the DAG can be translated into a Structural Equation Model (SEM), that is a set of three structural equations, involving three autonomous functions $f_X, f_{\boldsymbol{W}}$ and f_Y, as well as three exogenous random variables $U_X, U_{\boldsymbol{W}}$ and U_Y, sometimes called disturbances ([18, 19]). We will assume that $U_X, U_{\boldsymbol{W}}$ and U_Y are jointly independent. These sets of structural equations govern the distributions of the variables $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = (X, \boldsymbol{W}, Y)$ observed in the actual world and available in observational studies. But they also allow the description of what we would have observed in counterfactual worlds, if we could have intervened and forced the exposure to be set to $X = x_0$ (with $x_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ in the simple scenario considered here). This physical intervention can be modeled by the *do*-operator introduced by [20, 18]. In model $\mathcal{M}$, this operator modifies the value of X: instead of being the result of the autonomous function f_X, it is set to $X = x_0$. The *do*-operator further removes any arrow pointing to X in the DAG. For instance, in Figure 5, DAG a' and DAG c' are identical while DAG a and DAG c are different: the two causal models are identical in the counterfactual world that we would observe after the intervention $do(X = x_0)$, but are different in the actual world.

Causal effects represent a general ability to transfer changes among covariates ([19]), and the *do*-operator is a key tool for their definition in the SCMs framework. The intervention $do(X = x_0)$ does not affect functions f_{V_1} (nor disturbances U_{V_1}) for $V_1 \in \boldsymbol{V} \setminus \{X\}$, but it does affect the distribution of descendants of X in the DAG (its children, the children of its children, etc.). More precisely, in the *counterfactual* world following the intervention $do(X = x_0)$, model $\mathcal{M}$ would be model $\mathcal{M}_{x_0}$ leading to observations of the variables $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(x_0) = (x_0, \boldsymbol{W}_{x_0}, Y_{x_0})$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = (X, \boldsymbol{W}, Y)$. In case (a) for instance, we have $\boldsymbol{W}_{x_0} = f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) = \boldsymbol{W}$ but $Y_{x_0} = f_Y(x_0, \boldsymbol{W}_{x_0}, U_Y) = f_Y(x_0, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y)$, which is typically different from Y, unless $X = x_0$. The random variables $(Y_{x_0})_{x_0 \in \{0,1\}}$ are not (fully) observed: they are counterfactual variables, and correspond to potential outcomes ([35, 36, 37]). In the Marginal Structural Models (MSMs) framework ([38]), these counterfactual variables $(Y_{x_0})_{x_0 \in \{0,1\}}$ are connected to the variable Y observed in the actual world, through consistency constraints like the coherence assumption ([39]):

$$\text{(Coh)} \qquad (X = x) \Rightarrow (Y = Y_x), \quad \text{for all potential values } x \text{ of } X.$$


Actual world
DAG a
DAG b
DAG c
$\boldsymbol{W}$
X
Y
$\begin{cases} X &= f_X(U_X) \\ \boldsymbol{W} &= f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\ Y &= f_Y(X, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y) \end{cases}$
$\begin{cases} X &= f_X(U_X) \\ \boldsymbol{W} &= f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(X, U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\ Y &= f_Y(X, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y) \end{cases}$
$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{W} &= f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\ X &= f_X(\boldsymbol{W}, U_X) \\ Y &= f_Y(X, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y) \end{cases}$
Corresponding counterfactual worlds, following physical intervention $do(X = x_0)$
DAG a'
DAG b'
DAG c'
$\boldsymbol{W}$
$\boldsymbol{W}_{x_0}$
$X = x_0$
Y_{x_0}
$\begin{cases} X &= x_0 \\ \boldsymbol{W} &= f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\ Y_{x_0} &= f_Y(x_0, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y) \end{cases}$
$\begin{cases} X &= x_0 \\ \boldsymbol{W}_{x_0} &= f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(x_0, U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\ Y_{x_0} &= f_Y(x_0, \boldsymbol{W}_{x_0}, U_Y) \end{cases}$
$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{W} &= f_{\boldsymbol{W}}(U_{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\ X &= x_0 \\ Y_{x_0} &= f_Y(x_0, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y) \end{cases}$

Figure 5: Examples of DAGs and SEMs: actual and counterfactual worlds.

In words, this assumption states that the actual outcome for an individual whose actual level of exposure is x equals the outcome we would observe for this same individual in the counterfactual world following $do(X = x)$, *i.e.*, where exposure would be "physically" set to value x. This assumption can be violated in randomized clinical trial if full adherence is not guaranteed for instance. In the simple case of binary exposure considered here, the coherence assumption entails that $Y = XY_1 + (1 - X)Y_0$. Under this coherence assumption, Y_1 and Y_0 are therefore partially observed and causal inference from observational data can be seen as a missing data problem. One first advantage of SCMs over MSMs rests in the precise definition of the counterfactual variables from the model, thanks to the DAG and the corresponding SEM. For instance, it is easy to show that the coherence assumption is automatically fulfilled in the structural interpretation of counterfactual variables considered here, since $Y = f_Y(X, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y)$ and $Y_x = f_Y(x, \boldsymbol{W}, U_Y)$.

Once potential outcomes have been introduced (and precisely defined in the SCM framework),

causal effects can be precisely defined. In particular, in the simple example considered here where both X and Y are binary, the average causal effect of X on Y is defined as

$$\text{ACE} = \mathbb{E}(Y_1 - Y_0) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 1). \tag{3}$$

In the SCM framework, $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1)$ is the probability that the outcome variable Y would equal 1 in the counterfactual world following the intervention $do(X = x)$: using Pearl's notations, we have $\mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|do(X = x))$ (see, *e.g.*, Equation (7) in [19]). The average causal effect measures the difference between the risk of observing the outcome in the counterfactual world where all individuals would be exposed, $\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|do(X = 1))$, and the risk of observing the outcome in the counterfactual world where exposure would be eliminated, $\mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|do(X = 0))$. Here, causal effect is defined on the excess risk scale, but causal risk ratio or odds-ratio can of course be defined similarly: e.g., for the causal risk ratio, it is defined as $\mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1)/\mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 1)$.

So far, we have shown that the introduction of the *do*-operator and the counterfactual variables Y_1 and Y_0 allow a precise definition of causal effects. However, because such causal effects rely on quantities that are not (fully) observed in the actual world, a natural question arises whether these effects can be estimated from observational data.

Consider a general DAG G composed of observed variables $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$, with $(X, Y) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$. In the SCMs framework, $\mathbb{P}(Y = y|do(X = x)) = \mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$ is said to be identifiable if the assumptions embedded in DAG G ensure that this quantity is expressible in terms of the observable distribution $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = \boldsymbol{v})$; see Definition 1 in [23] for instance.

Here we start by recalling some standard conditions introduced in the literature, that are sufficient for identifiability of $\mathbb{P}(Y = y|do(X = x)) = \mathbb{P}(Y_x = y)$, when combined with the coherence assumption (Coh). These conditions ensure a certain level of "comparability" between exposed and non-exposed individuals in the actual world. In particular, the ignorability assumption reads as follows ([21]):

$$\text{(Ign)} \qquad Y_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X, \quad \text{for all potential values } x \text{ of } X,$$

where $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2$ stands for "V_1 and V_2 are independent". This assumption states that the outcome Y_x we would observe in the counterfactual world where exposure would be set to value x is independent of the actual level of exposure X. Under (Ign) and (Coh), the causal effect of X can be estimated from observations of the actual world, as long as $0 < \mathbb{P}(X = 1) < 1$. Indeed, by successively applying assumption (Ign) and (Coh), it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1|X = x) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x) \tag{4}$$

Under (Coh) and (Ign) the association measure between X and Y is said to be unconfounded and equals the causation measure. For instance, under (Coh) and (Ign), $\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = 0) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_0 = 1)$. Of course, (Ign) is a strong assumption and, as will be made clearer below, it does not hold in the presence of confounders for instance. In such cases, a conditional version of (Ign) can also been considered ([40]). In particular, assume that, for some variable $\boldsymbol{W}$, the following assumption holds:

$$\text{(C.Ign)} \qquad Y_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\boldsymbol{W}, \quad \text{for all potential values } x \text{ of } X,$$

where $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2|V_3$ stands for "V_1 and V_2 are conditionally independent given V_3". Then the so-called adjustment formula, or back-door formula ([20]), holds too:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1) &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \mathbb{P}(Y_x = 1|X = x, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under (Coh) and (C.Ign), we have

$$\text{ACE} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \{\mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) - \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\}\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}), \tag{5}$$

and ACE corresponds to a marginalized version of the adjusted excess risk. Under the Experimental Treatment Assignment (ETA) assumption, that is $0 < \mathbb{P}(X = x|\boldsymbol{W}) < 1$ almost everywhere, ACE can be estimated from observations of the actual world. Methods adapted to situations where the ETA assumption fails to hold have also been proposed (see [41] for a review and further extensions).

Appendix B Proof of approximation (2)

Under the assumption of no unmeasured confounder, $OR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) = COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$. Moreover, if $\mathbb{P}(F_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is small for $x \in \{0, 1\}$, then $COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \approx CRR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$, while if $\mathbb{P}(R_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is small for $x \in \{0, 1\}$, then $COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \approx CRR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$. Therefore, under these assumptions, and if $X \perp\!\!\!\perp A|(F, \boldsymbol{W})$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
COR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) &\approx CRR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(R_1 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(R_0 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(F_1 = 1, A_1 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(F_0 = 1, A_0 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(F_1 = 1, A_1 = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(F_0 = 1, A_0 = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(F = 1, A = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(F = 1, A = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(A = 1|F = 1, X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(A = 1|F = 1, X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(A = 1|F = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(A = 1|F = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(F = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(F_1 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(F_0 = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})} \\
&= CRR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}) \\
&\approx COR(X, F|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})
\end{aligned}
$$

Appendix C Population attributable fraction

The PAF ([42, 43]) is usually defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{PAF} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(R = 1) - \mathbb{P}(R_0 = 1)}{\mathbb{P}(R = 1)} &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(R = 1) - \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \mathbb{P}(R = 1|X = 0, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(R = 1)} \\
&= 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{p_{i,\boldsymbol{w}}}{RR_{i\boldsymbol{w}}} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X = 1|R = 1) - \sum_{\boldsymbol{w}} \frac{p_{1\boldsymbol{w}}}{RR_{1\boldsymbol{w}}}. \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}
$$

with $p_{i,\boldsymbol{w}} = \mathbb{P}(X = i, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}|R = 1)$ and $RR_{i\boldsymbol{w}} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(R=1|X=i,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w})}{\mathbb{P}(R=1|X=0,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{w})}$. Because $R = 1 \Rightarrow A = 1$, we have $p_{1,\boldsymbol{w}} = \mathbb{P}(X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}|R = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}|R = 1, A = 1)$: $p_{1,\boldsymbol{w}}$ and $\mathbb{P}(X = 1|R = 1)$

can therefore unbiasedly estimated from data describing the subpopulation $\{A = 1\}$ only. On the other hand, the $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific adjusted relative risks $RR_{1\boldsymbol{w}}$ can be approximated by the $\boldsymbol{w}$-specific adjusted odds-ratios $OR(X, R|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ provided $\mathbb{P}(R = 1|X = 1, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w})$ is small for $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}$. Therefore, under this assumption, all the quantities in (6) can be unbiasedly estimated or well approximated in case (i) and the PAF can therefore be approximately unbiasedly estimated in case (i).

Appendix D Why is there no guarantee that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\mathbf{W}, \mathcal{S})$ in case (ii)?



Figure 6: A special case of the DAG describing case (ii)

Consider the simplified DAG of Figure 6 and further assume that $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{A}$. Because this DAG is a special case of the DAG of the right panel of Figure 3 describing our case (ii), it is enough to show that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\mathcal{S}$ does not hold in this special case to ensure that there is no guarantee that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\boldsymbol{W}, \mathcal{S})$ under the DAG of Figure 3. Under the model depicted by the DAG of Figure 6, we have $\mathcal{R} \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\mathcal{S}$ of course, but $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\mathcal{S}$ is not guaranteed. This result can be shown using graph-based arguments but it can also easily be shown by a reduction to absurdity argument. Indeed, if $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\mathcal{S}$ then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = 1) &= \sum_s \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = 1|\mathcal{S} = s)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S} = s) \\
&= \sum_s \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = 1|\mathcal{S} = s, X = x)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S} = s) \quad \text{if } \mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|S \\
&= \sum_s \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R} = 1|\mathcal{S} = s, X = x)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S} = s) \quad \text{under the coherence assumption} \\
&= \sum_s \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R} = 1|\mathcal{S} = s)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S} = s) \quad \text{because } \mathcal{R} \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\mathcal{A} \text{ and } \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R} = 1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, if $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|\mathcal{S}$ we especially obtain $ACE = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_1 = 1) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_0 = 1) = 0$, which is generally false under the DAG of Figure 6.

Appendix E Proof of independence $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\mathbf{W}, \mathcal{A}_x)$ by the SWIG Approach

Denote by $\mathcal{R}_x$, F_x, V_x, $\mathcal{A}_x$ the counterfactual outcome variables we would observe in the counterfactual world following the intervention $X = x$.



Figure 7: The SWIT resulting from the intervention $do(X = x)$ in case *(ii)*

The fact that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(W, \mathcal{A}_x)$ can be shown using the SWIG approach ([44]). Figure 7 presents the SWIT corresponding to the intervention $do(X = x)$. From this representation, it directly follows that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|W$, and therefore that $\mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\boldsymbol{W}, \mathcal{A}_x)$. Then, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R} = 1|X = x, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}, \mathcal{A} = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = 1|X = x, \boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}, \mathcal{A}_x = 1) \quad \text{by consistency} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_x = 1|\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{w}, \mathcal{A}_x = 1) \quad \text{since } \mathcal{R}_x \perp\!\!\!\perp X|(\boldsymbol{W}, \mathcal{A}_x). \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$